**Template for the review of the document on linkages between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the 2030 agenda for sustainable development**

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Contact information* | | | |
| **Surname:** | | | Lahiri |
| **Given Name:** | | | Souparna |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | | |  |
| **Organization:** | | | Global Forest Coalition |
| **Address:** | | |  |
| **City:** | | | Amsterdam |
| **Country:** | | | Netherlands |
| E-mail: | | | [souparna.lahiri@gmail.com](mailto:souparna.lahiri@gmail.com) |
| ***Comments*** | | | |
| **Page** | **Paragraph** | **Comment** | |
| 0 | 0 | The document on the [Monitoring framework](https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/sbstta-24/post2020-monitoring-en.pdf) mentions that "the updated formulations of the proposed 2050 goals and the 2030 targets as well as proposed 2030 milestones are provided for context only" where as in this document such a text is lacking and simply mentions about a “draft” text. | |
| 0 | 0 | What is presented as “*updated* or *draft*goals and targets of the post-2020 GBF” to our knowledge does not have any other status besides speculation, and many of the comments of both Parties and observers to the meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on the GBF last February are not reflected in these draft goals and targets. So we feel they cannot be taken as a basis for this analysis or any SBSTTA documents in general. We urge the Secretariat to respect the inputs from both Parties and observers into the post-2020 GBF negotiations and not to pre-judge the outcome of this process. As a feminist coalition of IPOs and NGOs we are particularly concerned about the omission of a large number of suggestions to strengthen the human rights and gender dimension of the post-2020 GBF. | |
| 0 | 0 | Lack of gender mainstreaming, and integration of rights-based approaches in general in the “new” draft targets. | |
| 0 | 0 | The text mentions nature-based solutions and differentiates between “nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based approaches” which would imply NBS are not ecosystem-based approaches. So what are they? | |
| 0 | 0 | No reference to harmful investments and the need to address them. | |
| 0 | 0 | A profound assessment of the effectiveness and social impacts of existing protected areas is needed before a new protected area target is adopted. An assessment of real impacts of protected areas on SDG1, SDG 2 and SDG5 is needed. | |
| 28 | 12 | There are opportunities here to mainstream gender and if the opportunity to mainstreaming fails the Parties to the CBD would ignore their agreed Gender Plan of Action at the next Open-ended Working Group. | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  | Additional rows can be added to this table by selecting “Table” followed by “insert” and “rows below” | |

*Comments should be sent by e-mail to* [*secretariat@cbd.int*](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int) *by 25 July 2020*